DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 219 RC 006 281

AUTHOR	Taylor, Howard W.
TITLE	Agricultural Mechanization and the Migrant in New York State.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Genesco. Center for Migrant Studies.; State Univ. of New York, Genesco. Coll. of Arts and Science.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	57p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York State Migrant Center, Welles Building, State University College, Geneseo, New York 14454 ($1.00 plus postage)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Agricultural Laborers; *Agricultural Machinery; Church Migrant Projects; Community Migrant Projects; Economic Factors; Living Standards; *Migrants; *Research; *Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS	*New York State

ABSTRACT

Commissioned by the New York State Center for Migrant Studies, this study examined the rate and causes of agricultural mechanization in New York State and its effect upon the economic and living conditions of migrants, as well as the possible solutions to the problems uncovered. Examined in various stages of mechanization were 3 specific areas where potatoes, snap beans, and apples are grown (Onieda, Steuben, and Clinton counties). Then, a state-wide study of agents and agencies providing alternatives to unemployment and welfare for displaced migrant workers was made. One bean broker, 14 growers, 10 crew leaders, 45 crew members, 5 officials--each representing an agency specializing in job placement and/or retraining opportunities for migrants, 6 dairymen, and 6 presently working former migrants were interviewed. Questionnaires were returned by 64 members of 3 state agencies, 46 Cooperative Extension Agents, 42 growers and businesses, and 2 presently working former migrants. The interviews and questionnaires provided the data for this study. Descriptive statistics led to the following conclusions: (1) migrant workers have been and will continue to be displaced by machines; (2) mechanization may have very positive effects on the migrant worker, forcing him into more steady, often more skilled, positions which offer better wages and the chance for a more stable family and social life; (3) displaced migrant workers prefer to continue in agriculture; (4) there are openings in full-time agricultural positions; (5) former migrant workers have found satisfying full-time jobs; and (6) former migrants have received needed on-the-job training. Included are 4 recommendations, 4 interview guides, and 4 questionnaires. (MJB)

ED 065219

AGRICULTURAL MECHANIZATION AND THE MIGRANT IN NEW YORK STATE

by

Howard W. Taylor

RECEIVED
AUG 4 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEW YORK STATE CENTER FOR MIGRANT STUDIES

1972

State University College of Arts and Science
Geneseo, New York
14454

RC 006281

NEW YORK STATE CENTER FOR MIGRANT STUDIES

The New York State Center for Migrant Studies is an independent organization devoted to professional research in the areas of education, employment, community relations and other aspects of the conditions of migrant labor in the State of New York.

The principal purposes are to initiate studies relevant to understanding and improving the conditions of the migrant, and to publish and disseminate these studies. The New York State Center for Migrant Studies, co-sponsored by the New York State Education Department's Bureau of Migrant Education, John Dunn, Chief, and the State University College of Arts and Science at Geneseo, New York, Robert W. MacVittie, President, was founded in February 1968.

The study has been recommended for publication by the Publications Committee of the Executive Council of the Center as an important contribution to the understanding of the migrant problem. It has been approved by the Executive Council of the Advisory Board of the Center except as specifically indicated and supercedes all previous drafts released for private circulation prior to publication. However, the interpretations and conclusions of the study are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Center.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

* Robert Clark
William Cotton
John Dunn
Harry Gonzalez
Larry Grossman
* Patrick Hogan
Joseph Kolczynski
George Lindsay
* David Martin
Alberto Meza
James Proctor
Paul Reagan
* Edwin Rivera
* Arthur Rood
Gene Seymour
John Sodoma
* Dale Thompson
Timothy Weider

* PAST MEMBER

ADVISORY BOARD

* Rosemary Alexander
Alex Brown
* Boren Chertkov
Shirley Chisholm
Robert Cobb
Thomas Colahan
Raye Conrad
Sara Garcia
* Richard Haviland
Bennie Hill
Frank Horton
* David Huntington
Richard Klatt
Pratt Krull, Jr.
Olaf Larson
Robert MacVittie
David Martin
Dennis Mason
Stuart Mitchell

ADVISORY BOARD (Cont.)

* John Radebaugh
Edwin Rivera
Emilio Rivera
Jack Sable
Douglas Sinclair
Henry Steinglass
Edward Stevenson
Cassandra Stockburger
Richard Stolper
Roscoe Taylor
Marjorie VanArsdale
Reinhardt Van Dyke, Jr.
Frank Walkley
Shirley Wurz

STAFF

Gloria Mattera
Director

James O. Schnur
Project Director

Jackie Rhodes
Assistant Project Director

HOWARD TAYLOR

grew up on a livestock farm in Central Illinois. He received his B.S. degree in Agricultural Mechanization from the University of Illinois at Urbana in 1966. He joined the Air Force that year and was subsequently trained as a navigator, in which capacity he served for four years. During that time he traveled to various countries in Europe and Southeast Asia. He was stationed in Plattsburgh, N.Y., for three and one half years and separated from the Air Force in September, 1971. He is presently completing a thesis leading to a M.S. degree in Agricultural Economics, at the University of Illinois. Mr. Taylor has recently been hired as Agricultural Representative for the Bank of Pontiac, Pontiac, Illinois.

PREFACE

This study of the rate of and causes of agricultural mechanization in New York State, its effects on the economic and living conditions of migrants, and possible solutions to resulting problems was commissioned by the New York State Center for Migrant Studies in spring, 1970, and completed in spring, 1971. The study was limited in scope and depth, for practical reasons. Rather than studying one area of the state, the author chose to view three areas, in various stages of mechanization. It was hoped that the varying situations would give a more accurate view of the reasons for the increase in mechanization and the conditions which have resulted. The author did not intend to carry out extensive statistical research; he looked at the problem in New York and tried to find solutions, based on interviews with migrants and employers directly involved, to the problems which mechanization has caused the migrant. Growers and migrants in three New York counties were interviewed. In addition, officials of State agencies and private organizations throughout the State were contacted.

The author is especially grateful to the Agricultural Employment Representatives in the three counties -- Mr. Stephen Rauber, Mr. J. Russell Dahlon, and Mr. Herb Broestler -- who were extremely helpful in making the study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DESCRIPTION OF NEW YORK STATE CENTER FOR MIGRANT STUDIES	i
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR	ii
PREFACE	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS	3
RESEARCH PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION OF REPORT	4
PART I: INTERVIEWS WITH GROWERS AND MIGRANT WORKERS	6
Interviews with Growers	6
Oneida County Growers	6
Steuben County Growers	8
Clinton County Growers	10
Conclusions	11
Interviews with Migrant Workers	13
Oneida County Migrants	14
Steuben County Migrants	15
Clinton County Migrants	16
Conclusions	17
PART II: RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT POSSIBILITIES	18
Retraining Programs	19
Study of Employment Possibilities	22
Questionnaires to State Agencies	22
Migrant Ministry	23
Agricultural Employment Representatives	27
Cooperative Extension Agents	33
Conclusions	35

Page

Contacts with Prospective Employers 36

Contacts with Former Migrants in New Jobs 45

CONCLUSIONS 50

RECOMMENDATIONS 51

INTRODUCTION

It is generally recognized that in agriculture, as in most other industries, new technological developments have had or are having profound effects on labor. The increasing use of machinery in farm operations means fewer job openings for workers. The impact of this increased mechanization has been very strongly felt by seasonal farm workers, many of whom have been employed in crops which have lent themselves well to mechanized harvest. The migrant often necessarily has led an economically unstable existence, resulting in many social problems. Consequently, he has had more difficulty in adjusting to a mechanized society than other workers, and our society should be deeply concerned with helping him find solutions to the problems which often result from mechanization in agriculture.

Recent research shows that mechanization has resulted in fewer employment positions for seasonal farm workers, although the decrease, until recently, has been relatively gradual. However, the rate in the reduction of seasonal agricultural jobs available has increased since about 1965; it is expected that the rate will continue to increase for a few years. "Toward the Year 1985: Capital and Labor Requirements for Farming", a Cornell University publication authored by George L. Casler, shows that we are presently experiencing a transitional period. The report shows that in 1960, 36.9 thousand domestic seasonal farm workers were used in New York State during the peak period as compared to 34.0 thousand workers in 1965, with a projected figure of 20.0 thousand in 1975 and 13.9 thousand in 1985.[1] By simple arithmetic, one can arrive at a yearly average for the above stated periods. 1960-1965 represents an average yearly decrease of about 580 seasonal farm workers on the job. The 1965-1975 (projected) figures show about 1400 fewer jobs per year, a doubling in the rate of decrease. The projected 1975-1985 figures show a tapering off or an average yearly decrease of about 610.

Some people might reason that New York State should not concern itself with the future of the migrants who work in this State because most of them are residents of Florida or other southern states. However, it should be recognized that New York employers have been using this southern labor force for many years. Since the displacement of these workers is occurring in this State when New York agriculture is mechanized, the State has an obligation to those workers who may wish to settle in its confines. In fact, many have already settled in the State, some going onto New York welfare rolls. The State is forced to face the problem. New York does offer one of the most attractive welfare programs in the nation, but we all know

---

[1]Geroge L. Casler, Toward the Year 1985: Capital and Labor Requirements for Farming, Special Cornell Series Number 10, New York State College of Agriculture, at Cornell University (Ithaca, N. Y., 1970), p. 15.

that this type of program does not solve the problems of the needy. The migrant worker deserves something better than this; so does the taxpayer. Consideration should also be given to the fact that migrant workers, for the most part, have labored hard to earn a living and have tried to support themselves. Thus, they not only are especially deserving of help in overcoming employment problems, but are workers who can benefit from help, who can succeed. Efforts on their behalf can lead to permanent, not temporary, solutions.

The purpose of this study was to determine some of the reasons for and effects of mechanization in New York State and to find possible solutions to resulting problems. Information was gathered principally through talking with numbers of growers and migratory farm workers in three counties, although individuals throughout the State were contacted. In his talks with growers, the author tried to determine not only the rate at which they are turning to machine picking but their reasons for doing so, their opinions of the effectiveness of machines, and their attitudes toward the effect of mechanization on the migrant worker. The attitudes of the migrant workers concerning mechanization and its effects on their economic and living conditions and their preferences in future employment alternatives were also studied. The author then tried to find possible solutions to the employment problems which mechanization has presented to migrants. Job training programs were studied. A major emphasis was placed on finding employment opportunities for displaced workers, particularly in agriculture or agriculture-related industries. A list was compiled of businesses which have hired former migrants and/or would be interested in hiring them in the future.

It is intended that the information gathered and conclusions drawn will be aids to those who are attempting to help the seasonal farm worker to cope with an increasingly mechanized agriculture.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

1. The period during which the data in this report was gathered -- summer, 1970 to spring, 1971 -- was a period of economic slow down in the nation, a condition which was not conducive to finding new employment opportunities for displaced migrants.

2. The author recognizes that growers have been forced to mechanize in order to be competitive with other growers in the nation as well as in other nations.

3. This paper, though written with the sincere intention of benefiting the seasonal farm worker, is not intended to be in any way a condemnation of the grower. The author is fully aware of the practical and economic problems which confront the grower; he has had to turn to mechanization as a matter of economics.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

The report is divided essentially into two parts. The first portion deals with information gathered from growers of and migrant workers in three principal crops in New York State -- potatoes, snap beans, and apples. This portion of the research was further limited to three counties within the State; one of the three above-mentioned crops plays an important economic role in each county. The purpose of the second portion of the research was to find alternatives to unemployment and welfare for the displaced migrant worker; this part was not limited to the three counties but to New York State.

Oneida, Steuben, and Clinton counties were chosen for the first segment of the research because of the relative degree of mechanization for harvest of their principal crops. Oneida County is nearly totally mechanized in the harvest of snap beans. 250 seasonal farm workers were hired in the county in 1969 and 85 in 1970. It is estimated that 30 will be used in the 1971 season, only to operate machinery. Steuben County, where the principal crop is potatoes, is in a stage of transition from hand labor to machine harvesting. The 1969 harvest required 1400 seasonal farm workers. This number was reduced to 1300 in 1970, and the projected need for 1971 is 1200 workers. Mechanization has had little effect on the harvest of Clinton County's apple crop. The number of migrant workers used in this area has actually increased slightly. In 1969, 132 migrant workers were used to harvest the crop. The 1970 crop was harvested by 135 workers and the projection for 1971 is 140 workers.[1]

It is felt that choosing counties in the stated three stages of mechanization would allow a more representative collection of data to be attained. These three counties were considered to be characteristic of conditions throughout the State relating to:

(a) Degree or replacement of migrants with machines
(b) The consequences of this mechanization
(c) The outlook for the future.

Initial contact in each county was made through the New York State Employment Office. In each case, the Agricultural Employment Representative was quite helpful in providing information concerning migrants in the county as well as concerning community and growers' attitudes. With the help of the Agricultural Employment Representatives, a cross-section of growers and migrants was chosen for the interviews. Primary consideration was given to selecting growers with varying sized operations and varying attitudes concerning labor. In Steuben and Oneida Counties, an attempt was made to talk with growers who were in various stages of mechanization. An effort was made to interview migrant crews of the growers who were interviewed; this was not always possible, however.

---

[1]Because the State Employment does not give figures broken down by counties, the Agricultural Employment Representatives in the three counties gave the closest estimates possible, based on information from growers in the area.

Growers were interviewed prior to harvest, at a time when their time would not be so valuable and hopefully a more thorough and thoughtful interview could be attained. The migrant workers of each county were, of course, interviewed during the harvest season. The numbers of growers and migrants interviewed was kept small to allow a more detailed and informative interview.

During the second segment of the study, existing job retraining and placement programs benefiting migrants were observed, and new employment opportunities for migrants desiring to leave or forced from the stream were sought. The author personally talked with program officials and employers throughout the State; others were contacted by mail or telephone. The original intention was to seek job opportunities in both agricultural and nonagricultural industries. However, after interviewing the workers and finding their general desire to remain in agriculture, efforts were confined to rural area business and agriculture-related job opportunities. Possible future employers were sought and questioned as to their acceptance of former migrant workers and their willingness to train the workers.

In an attempt to determine community attitudes concerning migrants and possible employment opportunities for them throughout the State, questionnaires were sent to County Cooperative Extension Agents, Agricultural Employment Representatives, and members of the Migrant Ministry of the New York State Council of Churches. The questionnaires were also quite helpful in providing names of businesses which had actually employed former migrants.

It must be understood that some areas of the study had to be handled subjectively. The attitudes and feelings of growers and migrants were an important device in determining the direction of the research. With the many variables involved and with the limited resources available, the samples taken could not be rendered perfectly random or large enough to be completely statistically accurate. However, every attempt was made to obtain representative samples. The data is presented as accurately and readably as possible, with no ommissions which are in the writer's view significant.

PART I -- INTERVIEW WITH GROWERS AND MIGRANT WORKERS

Oneida County Growers

The snap bean harvest in Oneida County is nearly totally mechanized. The Agricultural Employment Representative for the New York State Employment Service estimated that 85 migratory farm workers were used for the 1970 harvest and predicts that only 30 will be needed for the 1971 crop; those 30 will be used only to operate machinery.

Five growers and one bean broker were interviewed in Oneida County in July 1970. The same questions were presented to the broker as to the growers; for purposes of summarizing the data, his views are considered with the rest. All the growers were mechanized. The following interview guide was used in talking with growers in all three counties:

Guide for Interviewing Growers

1. Are you satisfied with harvesting your crop by mechanical means vs. migrant labor?

   Why or why not?

2. Since the institution of mechanized harvesting, has the quality of your product been as high?

3. Have the members of your former labor force obtained jobs? If so, where?

4. What do you think mechanization has done to the migrant worker?

5. Would you hire or have you hired former migrants to perform mechanized tasks on a part-time or full-time basis?

   Why or why not?

6. Do you consider the average migrant worker capable of handling mechanized equipment?

7. What do you consider to be the one largest reason for the replacement of hand labor by machines?

8. Have you dealt with various ethnic groups of migrant workers? Do you observe a difference?

9. How successful do you think migrant workers would be in programs which would retrain them for other types of work?

10. What do you think are the best opportunities for the displaced migrants?

Oneida Growers -- Data Summarization

The following is a summarization of the data from the interviews with the growers of Oneida County. It is given in the order shown in the interview guide. The figures in parentheses indicate the number of growers who gave that response.

Question #1
(2) Mechanical harvest is quite satisfactory (beans sold for processing)
(4) Mechanical harvest is satisfactory but not as good as hand picking; economics demanded mechanization

Question #2
(6) Quality of mechanically picked crop not as high as hand picked

Question #3
(5) Not aware of whereabouts of former labor force
(1) Felt welfare was probably the destination

Question #4
(4) Mechanization has had a positive effect on migrants (forcing them into better jobs, etc.)
(1) Has added to the welfare rolls
(1) No idea

Question #5
(3) Have former migrants as full-time employees
(2) Stated they would hire full-time summer help
(1) Would use no former migrants as full-time help

Question #6
(2) Average migrant is a capable worker
(4) Some are capable but the average is not

Question #7
(6) Increasing problems associated with labor has been the reason for mechanizing (economics and government regulations were given as additional reasons)

Question #8
(6) Florida blacks comprise labor force

Question #9
(6) Some migrants are capable of being retrained, though the majority is not

Question #10
(6) Best opportunities for displaced migrants are in agriculture

The following additional observations and comments were made to the author in his talks with Oneida County growers and others in the community:

1. The snap bean harvesting machine costs about $17,000.

2. The machine goes over the field once and takes everything as opposed to three times through by hand.

3. There is more loss by machine; therefore, more acreage is required to get the same output.

4. Many crews refuse to pick beans because it is not as desirable work as picking many other crops.

5. The labor supply was more plentiful this year than ever before.

6. One grower added: "Many farmers would be receptive to a government subsidized training program on the farm . . . Migrants can't stand regimentation; maybe it's their background."

Steuben County Growers

Some growers in Steuben County have been using mechanical means for the harvest of their potato crop, or at least part of it. Although there is a trend toward increased mechanization, the change seems to be quite gradual, as the figures presented earlier indicate. 1400 migrant workers were used in the harvesting of the 1969 crop; the number was reduced to 1300 in 1970 and is expected to be 1200 in 1971. Much of the crop land is too rocky and rolling, not allowing optimum usage and operation of the present mechanical potato harvester; consequently, the trend toward mechanization will probably continue to be slow.

Most of the crop goes to the potato chip industry; it is therefore preferable for the potatoes to dry out on top of the ground before loading. The mechanical harvester does not allow this step. Many growers have harvesters which they have never used, but kept only as insurance against labor shortage at harvest time.

In Steuben County, four growers were interviewed in June 1970. One grower was totally mechanized. Two were still using all hand labor, and the fourth was harvesting his crop with about two-thirds hand labor and one-third mechanically. Also, one of the two growers who harvest totally by hand refused to answer many of the questions.

Steuben Growers -- Data Summarization

Question #1	(3) Prefer hand labor due to better crop quality (1) Prefers mechanical harvest due to increased efficiency
Question #2	(3) Quality of mechanical harvest is not as high (1) Quality is as high
Question #3	(3) Have former migrants as full-time employees (1) No answer
Question #4	(3) Mechanization has had a positive effect on migrants (1) No answer
Question #5	(3) Have former migrants as full-time employees (1) No answer
Question #6	(2) Average migrant is a capable worker (1) Average migrant is not a capable worker (1) No answer
Question #7	(3) Increasing problems with labor have been reason for mechanizing (1) Unavailability of labor
Question #8	(3) Florida blacks comprise labor force (1) No answer
Question #9	(2) Training would have a positive effect on migrants (1) Training would not have a positive effect (1) No answer
Question #10	(2) Best opportunities for displaced migrants are in agriculture (2) No opinion or no answer

The following additional observations and comments were made to the author in his talks with Steuben County growers and others in the community:

1. One farmer had built a new camp with all the proper approval. The required space at the time was 40 sq. ft. per person. In order to accommodate the number of workers he needed to hire, he built three-man rooms 10' by 12'. The following year new government regulations calling for 50 sq. ft. per person were instituted, therefore allowing only two men per room in this camp and cutting the grower's labor force by a third.

2. There were many other complaints about increasing and changing government requirements for the camps.

3. The former migrants in full-time employ of two of the growers interviewed were observed. In one case the man seemed to be treated with respect. In the other case, the worker was treated with very little consideration.

Clinton County Growers

The fresh apple crop has not lent itself to mechanized harvesting. This condition is true throughout the state, not just in Clinton County. Until the last few seasons, many of the growers had harvested the crop with local labor. Apparently, however, picking apples is not as attractive as it used to be; at any rate, getting the required local help has proved increasingly difficult. With the increasing problem, Clinton County growers who had not already done so turned to migratory labor.

It should be brought to the reader's attention that apple picking is one of the most desirable types of migrant work, both from the standpoint of working conditions and wages. Most of the crews which work in Clinton County come straight north from the Florida citrus crop only to pick apples. As soon as the crop is harvested, they return to Florida. Many of the crews are personally known by the grower and return year after year. Because they are not gone from Florida too long a period, many of the workers here are able to hold relatively steady jobs in their home state. In these ways the labor hired in this area differs from that in Oneida and Steuben Counties.

Five of the seven major growers in Clinton County were interviewed during June 1970. All growers who could be easily contacted were interviewed. The interview guide used was the same as that used in Oneida and Steuben Counties.

Clinton Growers -- Data Summarization

Question #1	(5) Strongly prefer hand labor
Question #2	(5) Have not even considered using mechanized apple harvester in its present stage of development
Question #3	(5) Had no knowledge of any migrants settling in Clinton County
Question #4	(5) Mechanization has had no negative effect on labor and it has led to overall improvement in quality of hand-picked crop
Question #5	(5) Have had no migrants stay but would consider hiring them if help were needed
Question #6	(4) The average migrant is a capable worker (1) Using migrant help for the first time and could not answer
Question #7	(5) Lack of qualified labor has been the reason for mechanization
Question #8	(4) Florida blacks comprise labor force (1) British West Indies

Question #9 (5) Migrants would benefit from retraining

Question #10 (3) Mechanized agriculture offers the best opportunities
(2) There are no displaced migrants

The following additional observations and comments were made to the author in his talks with Clinton County growers and others in the community:

1. The housing provided for migrant workers in Clinton County is better than average.

2. Two growers commented that mechanized apple picking will only come in the form of a picking aid.

3. The growers in Clinton County consider their seasonal labor to be highly skilled and capable in their jobs. They hold the migrant workers in a high degree of respect.

4. One grower expressed concern over the increasing mechanization of the citrus fruit harvest, because workers who come to Clinton County for two months, at the most, spend the remainder of their time with the citrus crop in Florida. He felt that this mechanization would make it more difficult to obtain the labor needed for the apple harvest.

5. One grower reported $3.45/hr. as the average wage for the season's apple harvest.[1]

6. Growers in this area seem more prosperous than the average farmer; their operations are relatively large, employing up to twenty (20) full-time people.

Conclusions Based on Interviews with Growers

Based on the interviews with the growers in the three counties, the following trends are noted:

1. Machines do not provide an acceptable method of harvest for fresh market apples. Because of economic demands, however, mechanized picking has become the norm in the harvest of snap beans and is replacing hand labor in the harvest of potatoes. In the immediate future, there will be some demand for migrant labor, though not on the previous scale.

---

[1]Burrell Orchards reported this figure for the 1969 season.

2. Many Steuben County potato growers do not consider mechanized harvest as acceptable a method as handpicking; even in Oneida County, which is almost totally mechanized, some growers feel that hand picking of snap beans yields a crop of higher quality. Growers who often prefer the results of hand picking have turned to mechanized harvest because of labor-associated problems. It is often difficult to procure and retain labor at the exact time it is needed; workers often leave toward the end of the harvest season when the picking is not as economically rewarding. Growers face many problems in meeting government migratory labor regulations, particularly those concerning housing, which often change from year to year.

3. In instances, growers have hired former migrants for full-time positions and have found their work satisfactory.

4. Most growers feel that mechanization has had no negative effect on the migrant worker and may in fact have a positive one; for example, mechanization has created more skilled, better-paying jobs in agriculture which former migrants could fill.

5. There are mixed opinions as to the capability of the migrant worker and the possibility of his successful retraining for other kinds of work. However, many growers feel that some migrant workers could be successfully retrained and placed in full-time positions.

6. Many growers indicated willingness to hire migrants for full-time positions.

7. The apple growers feel that lack of qualified labor is the reason for the rapid increase in the use of machines. They presently have a definite need for qualified workers.

8. Most growers feel that agriculture offers the best employment opportunities for displaced migrant workers.

Interviews with Migrants

This portion of the report deals with the results of the interviews with migrants in the three New York counties. The number of migrant workers interviewed varied with the degree of mechanization in that county, i.e., the largest number were interviewed in Clinton County while the smallest number were interviewed in Oneida. The questions were formulated to determine to some extent the worker's occupational experience. His preferences concerning possible alternatives if he were displaced by mechanization were also sought.

The following guide was used in interviewing the migrant workers, as well as the crew leaders, in all three counties. There was slight refinement of some of the questions and a change in their order, which occurred early in the course of the research. The following guide represents the refined product, though the same information was found in the earliest interviews and is presented in the same order for all three counties.

Interview Guide for Migrant Workers on the Job

1. Where do you live during most of the year?
2. What crops have you picked?
3. What states and counties have you picked in?
4. Are you usually in the citrus crop?
5. How long have you been picking? How long with this grower?
6. Do you think the use of machines in harvesting crops will put you out of a job?
7. Would you like to operate machinery?
8. Would you prefer to continue working in agriculture or going to some other type of job if your job changes and you are not picking crops?
9. Would you be willing to move to a new area to work in agriculture?
10. Would you accept training for a new, more regular job?
11. Would you mind moving to the city? Why or why not?
12. How should you get your retraining?

Oneida Migrants

In Oneida County, two (2) crews and twelve (12) workers were interviewed in July of 1970. The first crew was composed of local residents who were out of work most of the year except for seasonal farm work. They were picking at the time of the interviews. The crew numbered twelve (12) people at that time. The crew leader and four (4) other members were interviewed. The second crew was interviewed at their camp on the day of their arrival. The author noted fifteen (15) adults at the location, though the crew leader stated that he was expecting a total of thirty-five (35). The crew leader and eight other members were interviewed. At the time of the interview, the crew leader was trying to locate his missing truck, which had been left in the hands of one of his crew members to bring north. The truck contained the belongings of the crew members. This was the crew leader's first year in that position, a job which he had inherited from his father, who was also present to assist. The father had only recently recovered from a two-year illness resulting from crop dust poisoning.

Oneida County Migrants -- Data Summarization

Question #1	(5) Were local (first crew) (9) Were from Florida (second crew)
Question #2	(11) Were experienced bean pickers (3) Had not previously picked beans
Question #3	(9) Reside in Florida most of the year
Question #4	(14) Were not normally in the citrus crop
Question #5	(14) Previously had spent some time as pickers
Question #6	(8) Felt that the future in their job is uncertain due to mechanization (6) Had no opinion or were not concerned about mechanization
Question #7	(9) Indicated a willingness or desire to operate mechanized equipment (5) Did not indicate this
Question #8	(12) Stated a desire to stay in agriculture (2) Did not wish to stay in agriculture
Question #9	(10) Indicated a willingness to move to a new area to work in agriculture (4) Were unwilling

Question #10	(14) Stated that they would accept training for another job
Question #11	(7) Preferred country living (7) Already lived in the city
Question #12	(11) Thought government help in their retraining would be desirable (3) Had no opinion

Steuben County Migrants

In Steuben County, four (4) crew leaders and thirteen (13) crew members were interviewed in July of 1970. Two (2) of the thirteen (13) were on one crew and eleven (11) were on another. The season was in its early stages and some crew leaders were in the area without their crews. This is the reason that in two cases the only member to be interviewed was the crew leader.

Steuben Migrants -- Data Summarization

Question #1	(13) Were from Alabama (3) Were from Florida (1) Was from New York
Question #2	(11) Were in the potato crop for the first time (6) Were veterans in the crop
Question #3	(13) Remained in Alabama most of the time
Question #4	(14) Do not normally work the citrus crop (3) Normally work the citrus crop
Question #5	(6) Were in the field for the first time (11) Were veteran pickers
Question #6	(10) Felt the future in their job is uncertain due to mechanization (7) Were not concerned about increasing mechanization
Question #7	(14) Indicated a willingness or desire to operate mechanized equipment (3) Stated they would not or weren't sure
Question #8	(14) Stated a desire to stay in agriculture (3) Did not wish to stay in agriculture
Question #9	(16) Indicated a willingness to move to a new area to work in agriculture (1) Because of his interests in the area in which he lived would not be willing to move

Question #10	(14) Stated they would accept training for another job (3) Stated they would not
Question #11	(16) Preferred country living (1) Did not mind living in the city
Question #12	(17) Thought government help in their retraining would be desirable

Clinton County Migrants

In Clinton County, members of four crews were interviewed in September of 1970. This group included four (4) crew leaders and four (4) members from each crew, for a total of twenty (20). The crews were staying at three different locations and working for three different growers. All of those interviewed had come directly from Florida, specifically to pick the apple crop in Clinton County. These workers seemed to be better-educated and enjoy a higher standard of living than those interviewed in the other two counties. Many had trade school or some college education.

Clinton Migrants -- Data Summarization

Question #1	(20) Were from Florida
Question #2	(16) Normally pick citrus fruits and apples (4) Had picked other crops
Question #3	(20) Normally worked in Florida
Question #4	(16) Were normally in the citrus crop (4) Were in jobs other than crop picking most of the year
Question #5	(20) Were veteran pickers
Question #6	(14) Felt mechanization poses no threat to their jobs in apple and citrus crops (5) Felt the future in their jobs is uncertain due to mechanization (1) Had no opinion
Question #7	(16) Indicated a willingness or desire to operate mechanized equipment (4) Did not indicate this
Question #8	(17) Had no preference for working in agriculture (3) Indicated a desire to stay in agriculture

Question #9	(13) Indicated a willingness to move to a new area to work in agriculture (7) Would be reluctant to do so
Question #10	(19) Stated they would accept training for a better job (1) Stated he would not
Question #11	(14) Indicated a definite preference for living in the country (6) Did not
Question #12	(7) Expected the government to provide retraining (8) Expected to finance needed retraining themselves (1) Expected business to carry the burden (4) Had no opinion

Conclusions Based on Interview with Migrants

Based on the interviews with the migrant farm workers in the three New York counties, the following trends are noted:

1. Although some seasonal farm workers are concerned about mechanization's increasing role in agriculture and its threat to their jobs, a surprising number of those in crops which are partially or almost totally mechanized are unconcerned.

2. There is a willingness or desire by most to learn how to operate the machines which mechanization has made so important in modern agriculture.

3. Though most of the apple pickers have no preference for employment in agriculture, those working in the other crops do. The apple pickers, for the most part, indicated willingness to stay in agriculture if the jobs were available, however.

4. Most migrants are willing to move in order to find employment.

5. Most migrant workers are receptive to the idea of retraining if new job skills are required.

6. There is a definite preference for living in the country or rural areas.

PART II -- RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT POSSIBILITIES

Recognizing that those migrant workers to whom mechanization poses an immediate threat prefer alternate job opportunities in agriculture and that many growers have indicated willingness to hire former migrants for full-time positions, the author began the second portion of the study. Because of the more immediate threat of job displacement in the bean and potato crops, the emphasis was placed on the preferences of the migrants interviewed in those crops. The purpose of this segment of the research was the discovery of satisfactory alternatives to unemployment and welfare for displaced migrant workers. The assumption was made that the samples in the first portion of the study were representative not only of the counties from which they were taken but also of the state in its three relative stages of harvest mechanization.

The fact that those most likely to be replaced indicated willingness to enter retraining programs and would prefer having new jobs in agriculture made the next logical step a search for present retraining programs which prepare former migrants for full-time positions in agriculture. At the time the author was talking with retraining program officials, no operating project was discovered which trained workers for new jobs in agriculture. One of the programs which was studied was planning such a project, however, and has since begun its operation.

Five programs involving job placement and/or retraining for non-agricultural positions were located; officials were interviewed in an attempt to shed some light on possible solutions to the overall problem of the migrant worker in a mechanized agriculture. Four of these work specifically with migrants; the fifth had proposed the previously-mentioned plan of retraining migrants for full-time positions in agriculture. The programs in the state today range from those concerned with job placement to those intended to implement an overall educational process which nearly remolds the individual. Through interviews with people working in these programs, the author was able to locate and interview some former migrants who have been relocated in new jobs. The programs studied and officials contacted were:

(1) HVOIC - Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center
54 N. Hamilton St., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Nelson Johnson, Placement Director

(2) SUMAC - Southern Ulster Migrant Assistance Committee
Rt. 9W, Highland, N. Y.
*Harley Taylor, Director

(3) REACH - Rural Educational and Cultural Horizons
Perkinsville, N. Y.
Robert Molinari, Service Center Coordinator

(4) SEA - Seasonal Employment in Agriculture
50 Old Quoque Rd., Riverhead, N. Y.
*Ray Nelson, Director

(5) Self-Help Housing
Calverton, N. Y.
*Edwin Geyer, Director

*Though contacted by phone or mail, conflicting schedules prevented personal discussions with those officials. An alternate official was interviewed.

The purposes and activities of the programs are briefly summarized below.

HVOIC - Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center

HVOIC has placed "over 400 previously underemployed citizens into more meaningful jobs with an overall retention rate of 90%."[1] Officials feel that because theirs is a private corporation, it is much more efficient than a government-operated program. They feel they have an added advantage in placing people because of their previous successful contacts with businesses in the area. Anyone entering the program takes a series of tests to determine his educational level. From there the organization begins to build the "whole man", through training in the basic educational skills which the individual lacks followed by more specific training for a particular job. They emphasize the building of the individual's confidence and sense of dignity.

In May, 1971, HVOIC began operation of a program designed to retrain former seasonal farm workers for full-time positions in the Hudson Valley area. Twenty-four (24) former migrants and farm workers are presently participating in this program, which is located at 609 Broadway, Kingston, New York, and headed by Mr. Leonard Kelly. The participants will be tested and then taught the basic skills they need in order to go on to skill training in a specific vocation. Jobs are found for all participants before they begin their training; they are given the skills required in the particular position which they have been promised. The knowledge that he will be hired at the end of this training gives the trainee added incentive and confidence. Recognizing the desire of the majority of migrants to stay in agriculture, HVOIC designed this program to emphasize training for positions in agriculture. In cooperation with the Ulster County Community College, it offers training in: farm equipment repair, small motor repair, pruning, ground maintenance, and plant care. Those participants who prefer positions outside agriculture can choose among courses which will prepare them for these positions: service station attendant, teaching or nursing aide, key punch operator, clerical worker, licensed practical nurse, or worker in public utilities.

---

[1]From HVOIC mimeographed materials.

SUMAC - Southern Ulster Migrant Assistance Committee

Formerly headed by Mr. Harley Taylor, SUMAC has recently been absorbed by the Ulster County Community Action Committee, with offices at 286 Clinton Street, Kingston, New York. SUMAC was involved in teaching trades to migrants in their free time and to former migrants needing skills. This work included teaching the barber trade to workers in migrant camps and efforts to initiate a self-help housing project.

The organization was able to find employment for all of the migrant workers who came to it for help and chose to stay in the area after the 1970 picking season. It was estimated that twenty (20) were placed during 1970. Placement and retraining are only two of the ways SUMAC found to assist migrant workers; its activities included tutorial classes for the children of migrant workers, sewing classes for the wives and daughters, and in some cases provision of needed food and clothing.

REACH - Rural Educational and Cultural Horizons

The emphasis of Project Reach is on the education and general welfare of the migrant worker. The organization's program has not formerly included a plan for retraining workers for positions in agriculture; however, REACH is now working with the Steuben County Cooperative Extension Service on a proposed project which would retrain low-income workers for such positions. Its purpose would be to improve the economic conditions of these workers by giving them new skills which are in demand in agriculture today. The proposed program would combine some formal study through the Agricultural Technical College, Alfred, New York, with on-the-job training at various farms. This would give the prospective employee an edge by teaching him many of the fundamental theories and then showing him how to implement them. As presently proposed, the program would prepare trainees to be dairy farm hands and farm equipment operators. This program looks particularly promising for migrants who wish to go into full-time agricultural work because it would prepare them for work of a more skilled nature, in positions which do have openings at the present time.

SEA - Seasonal Employment in Agriculture

This organization is somewhat smaller than the others observed but plays a positive role in helping migrant workers. It is headed by Mr. Ray Nelson. The function of SEA is to help find job placement for a migrant worker who has broken from a crew and wants to remain in New York. SEA prefers to place people who have definite employment objectives and some trade skill already acquired. The organization is prepared to provide housing for an individual who has broken from a migrant crew until he is established in a new job and has found housing.

Self-Help Housing

Self-Help Housing, headed by Mr. Edwin Geyer, is a relatively large, quite successful training program for former migrant workers. It incorporates the building of one's own home with the acquiring of a specific skill in construction work. During a three-year period, fifteen families built and moved into their own homes.

In addition to the home building, Self-Help Housing has organized and is operating a Credit Union, a day care center, and many types of skill-development courses. The home building is performed in the off hours of workers who hold full-time positions. Many found their jobs with the help of Self-Help Housing. The organization is also involved in the evolution of new products, to be made by former migrants, and in the development of a market for these goods.

One of the fruits of the program has been the formation of a construction firm by six of the men who had built their own homes. The firm employs fifteen people during the building season. It has won several contract bids and is developing quite a good reputation as a construction company.

In summation, it can be noted that in some areas of New York State organizations are offering assistance in securing new employment to the migrant who wishes to or is forced to leave the migrant stream. There is a need, however, for more opportunities for migrants to receive retraining in the skills needed for full-time employment in agriculture; and, of course, the needs of all cannot be met with the existing resources.

STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT POSSIBILITIES

The author felt it would be helpful to determine to some extent the suitability of particular areas of New York State for settlement by migrant workers wishing to remain in the State and secure full-time positions. As an initiation of this segment of the study, questionnaires were sent to members of three agencies in New York State. The questionnaire was formulated to determine:

(1) community receptiveness to former migrants settling in an area

(2) the numbers and types of jobs available in an area

(3) the willingness of area employers to hire former migrant workers

(4) the names of employers of former migrants or those who might be willing to hire them

(5) the presence of on-the-job training programs in area businesses

(6) the degree of satisfaction of employers of former migrants and of the migrants themselves (follow-up letters and questionnaires were sent to employers and migrants)

The questionnaires were sent to members of the following three agencies:

(1) Migrant Ministry, New York State Council of Churches -- Because of its special interest in migrant workers and its activities helping them, this agency was selected. Twenty-seven questionnaires were sent throughout the State. Twelve were returned.

(2) Cooperative Extension Service, New York State, U. S. Department of Agriculture -- This agency has a close contact with farmers, growers, and rural business in general and was selected for these reasons. Fifty-six questionnaires were sent to agents throughout the State; forty-six were returned.

(3) New York State Employment Service, Farm Employment Division -- Agricultural Employment Representatives were contacted because of their knowledge of the agricultural employment picture as well as their close work with growers and migrant workers. The response was quite poor. The New York State Employment Security Superintendent elected to deny responses to the questionnaires from his Agricultural Employment Representatives. Of thirty-eight questionnaires sent, only six were returned.

In addition to the factors previously mentioned, the questionnaires were intended to show statewide geographic trends in employment outlooks and community attitudes. The author felt that the low percentage of returns prevented attaining a sample large enough to allow such trends to be clearly indicated.

The returns from each of the three groups will be listed separately in order to prevent an inaccurate picture, caused by overlapping data. It must be remembered that many of the questions were subjective in nature and called for opinions on the part of the respondent.

Migrant Ministry

Responses were received from these listed areas of the Migrant Ministry:

Milton Area
Dutchess Area
Genesee-Orleans Area
Oswego Area
W. Winfield Area
Altamont Area
Ontario-Yates Area
Monroe Area
Southwestern Area (Chautauqua and Cattaraugus Counties)
Clinton, Rome, Bridgewater Area
Genesee Area
Niagara Area

Two of the responses were in letter form, one requesting $25 for a returned questionnaire. The following letter of introduction and questionnaire was sent. A stamped self-addressed envelope was also enclosed.

NEW YORK STATE CENTER FOR MIGRANT STUDIES

state university college of arts and science

geneseo, new york • 14454 • 716-245-548

March 22, 1971

ADVISORY BOARD

ALAN BROWN
Lyons

SHIRLEY CHISHOLM
Brooklyn

ROBERT COBB
Syracuse

THOMAS COLAHAN
Geneseo

KAYE CONRAD
Brockport

WILLIAM COTTON
Geneseo

JOHN DUNN
Albany

SARA GARCIA
Florida

HARRY GONZALEZ
Rochester

LARRY GROSSMAN
Buffalo

BENNIE HILL
Perkinsville

FRANK HORTON
Rochester

RICHARD KLATT
Rochester

JOSEPH KOLCZYNSKI
Savannah

R. PRYLE KRULL, JR.
Batavia

DEAN LARSON
Ithaca

GEORGE LINDSAY
Hilton

ROBERT MacVITTIE
Geneseo

JESSIE MARTIN
Geneseo

DENNIS MASON
Geneseo

ARMANDO MEZA
Port Jervis

[illegible]
Lyons

[illegible]
Albion

[illegible]
Albany

[illegible]
Buffalo

[illegible]
Albion

JACK SABIN
New York City

[illegible]
Ithaca

DOUGLAS SINCLAIR
Rochester

[illegible]
Rochester

[illegible]
Albion

[illegible]
Albany

[illegible]
Albany

[illegible]
New York City

[illegible]
Geneseo

[illegible]
Geneseo

[illegible]
Albany

[illegible]
Albany

[illegible]
Albany

New York State Center for Migrant Studies
State University College
Geneseo, New York

Questionnaire Concerning Suitability of Particular Areas Of New York State For Settlement By Former Migrants Seeking Permanent Employment

1. In your opinion, what would be the attitude of your community toward a former migrant settling in the area?

   Positive Negative Indifferent

   Comments: For example, would a migrant hoping to settle in the area meet problems not encountered by others when seeking housing, credit, or inclusion in community activities and organizations?

2. Do you think employers in your area would consider a former migrant a desirable employee?

3. Are there presently any former migrants working in non-migratory, year-round positions in your area?

   Yes No
   Give approximate numbers, if possible.

   If you would be willing to list names, I would be interested in contacting and talking with former migrants.

4. In reference to question three (3), if such a situation does exist, do the workers and employers seem satisfied?

5. If possible, would you list the names and addresses of businesses and growers in your area which either have hired former migrants, have indicated willingness to hire them, or in your opinion might be receptive to the possibility if contacted.

Migrant Ministry - Data Summarization

The following is the summarized data from the twelve (12) questionnaires received from members of the Migrant Ministry. The data is given in the order shown on the questionnaire. Some respondents chose not to answer certain questions. The figures indicate the number of respondents giving that response.

Item #1 What would be the attitude of your community toward a former migrant settling in the area?

Positive	Negative	Mixed	No Answer
1	5	5	1

Item #2 Do you think employers in your area would consider a former migrant a desirable employee?

Yes	No	No Answer
7	3	2

Item #3 Are there presently any former migrants working in non-migratory, year-round positions in your area?

Yes	No	Uncertain or no answer
7	2	3

Of the seven given a "yes" response, four indicated numbers, totaling 56. The other three indicated that some migrants had settled in their areas.

Item #4 Do employers seem satisfied?

Yes	No	Uncertain	No Answer
5	0	2	5

Do workers seem satisfied?

5	0	2	5

Item #5 Names of growers and businesses which have hired or might hire former migrants.

The information given on this question is included in a list at the end of this section which also gives the names of businesses and growers mentioned by members of the other agencies contacted.

Agricultural Employment Representatives

As previously stated, the response through the State Employment Office was quite disappointing, though some useful information was provided by the returned questionnaires. The following letter of introduction and attached questionnaire was used.

NEW YORK STATE CENTER FOR MIGRANT STUDIES

state university college of arts and science

geneseo, new york • 14454 • 716-245-5481

March 22, 1971

ADVISORY BOARD
ALEX BROWN
Lyons
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM
Brooklyn
ROBERT COSE
Syracuse
THOMAS COLAHAN
Geneseo
RAYE CONRAD
Brockport
*WILLIAM COTTON
Geneseo
*JOHN DUNN
Albany
SARA GARCIA
Florida
*HARRY GONZALEZ
Rochester
*LARRY GROSSMAN
Buffalo
BENNIE HILL
Perkinsville
FRANK HORTON
Rochester
RICHARD KLATT
Rochester
*JOSEPH KOLCZYNSKI
Savannah
R. PRATT KRULL, JR.
Dansville
OLAF LARSON
Ithaca
*GEORGE LINDSAY
Hilton
ROBERT MACVITTIE
Geneseo
DAVID MARTIN
Geneseo
DENNIS MASON
Geneseo
*ALBERTO MEJIA
Penn Yan
STUART MITCHELL
Lyons
*JAMES PROCTOR
Albion
*PAUL REAGAN
Albany
EDWIN RIVERA
Buffalo
EMILIO RIVERA
Albany
JACK SABLE
New York City
*GENE SEYMOUR
Geneva
DOUGLAS SINCLAIR
Rochester
*JOHN SODOMA
Brockport
HENRY STEINGLASS
Albion
EDWARD STEVENSON
Bronx
CASSANDRA STOCKBURGER
New York City
RICHARD STOLPER
Geneseo
ROSCOE TAYLOR
Lamont
MARJORIE VANARSDALE
Castile
REINHARDT VANDYKE, JR.
Riverhead
FRANK WALKLEY
Castile
*TIMOTHY WEIDER
Perkinsville
ILEY WURZ
ed
*EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
STAFF
GLORIA MATTERA
Director
JAMES SCHNUR
Project Director
JACKIE RHODES
Assistant Project Director

Dear Mr.

I am working with the New York State Center for Migrant Studies, researching the effects of agricultural mechanization on the living and economic conditions of migrants in the state, and trying to find solutions to the economic instability which may result from this mechanization. I am presently trying to find employment opportunities in New York State for migrants who are displaced by mechanization and wish to leave the migrant stream, accept a full-time position, and settle permanently in a community.

I am hoping that you can give me information concerning the suitability of your area by completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire regarding the availability of positions in agriculture or agribusiness and the attitudes of growers, businessmen, and the community as a whole. I have found, in my talks with migrants, that most would prefer to work in agriculture or agriculture-related industries if they are displaced as field workers by machines. For this reason, I am particularly interested in finding employment opportunities in this field.

I appreciate your time and concern and would be interested in any additional comments or observations you may have which do not fall within the scope of the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Howard W. Taylor

New York State Center for Migrant Studies
State University College
Geneseo, New York

Questionnaire Concerning Suitability of Particular Areas Of New York State For Settlement By Former Migrants Seeking Permanent Employment

1. Are there jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries in your county for unskilled labor?

None Few Many

If possible, name the types and approximate numbers of available jobs.

2. Are there jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries in your county for semi-skilled labor?

None Few Many

If possible, name the types and approximate numbers of available jobs.

3. If positions are available, do you think employers in the area would consider a former migrant desirable for the positions?

Yes No Under certain conditions (List conditions)

4. Do you think that former migrants would have to be retrained in order to be acceptable for work in your area?

Yes No

5. If so, what type of program do you feel would be most successful or suitable in your area?

a. Financed and managed by the government
b. Financed or subsidized by government - managed by private industry
c. Financed and managed by private industry

Comments:

6. Is private industry in your area willing to train unskilled individuals?

Yes No

If so, please name specific industries which have indicated willingness or have instituted training programs.

7. Are there presently any former migrants working in non-migratory, year-round positions in your county?

Yes No

Approximate numbers, if possible.

If so, do the workers and employers seem satisfied?

8. In your opinion, what would be the attitude of your community toward a former migrant settling in the area?

Positive Negative Indifferent

Comments:

If possible, would you list the names and addresses of businesses in your area which either have hired former migrants, have indicated willingness to hire them, or in your opinion might be receptive to the possibility if contacted.

Agricultural Employment Representatives - Data Summarization

Item #1 Are there jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries in your county for unskilled labor?

None	Few	Many	No Answer
2	3	0	1

The numbers given totaled 44 available jobs.

Item #2 Are there jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries in your county for semi-skilled labor?

None	Few	Many	No Answer
0	5	0	1

The numbers given totaled 22 available jobs.

Item #3 If positions are available, do you think employers in the area would consider a former migrant worker desirable for the positions?

Yes	No	No Answer	Under Conditions
1	1	2	2

Item #4 Do you think that former migrants would have to be retrained in order to be acceptable for work in your area?

Yes	No	No Answer
5	0	1

Item #5 If so, what type of program do you feel would be most successful or suitable for your area?

Government	Government and Industry	Industry	No Answer
1	4	0	1

Item #6 Is private industry in your area willing to train unskilled individuals?

Yes	No	No Answer
1	4	1

Item #7 Are there presently any former migrants working in non-migratory, year-round positions in your county?

Yes	No	No Answer
3	2	1

If so, do the workers seem satisfied?

Yes	No	Uncertain	No Answer
2	0	1	3

Do the employers seem satisfied?

Yes	No	Uncertain	No Answer
2	0	1	3

Item #8 In your opinion, what would be the attitude of your community toward a former migrant settling in the area?

Positive	Negative	Indifferent	No Answer
1	0	4	1

The additional information given on this question is included in a list at the end of this section concerning the questionnaires.

Cooperative Extension Agents - Data Summarization

The same letter of introduction and attached questionnaire was sent to the Cooperative Extension Agents throughout the State as to the Agricultural Employment Representatives. The data is given in the order shown on the questionnaire. The figures indicate the number of agents who gave that particular answer to the question.

Item #1 Are there jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries in your county for unskilled labor?

None	Few	Many	No Answer
9	32	2	2

Not all respondents gave the types of jobs available. Very few indicated specific numbers of jobs available. The information given is summarized below, with the figures indicating the estimated number of jobs available in that county, when the information was given.

Dairy Farm Worker
Oswego Co. (5)
Cortland Co.
Fulton Co.
Chenango Co.
Dutchess Co. (10-20)

Farm Laborer
Cattaraugus Co.
Seneca Co. (1-2)
Essex Co.
Columbia Co.
Westchester Co. (50)
Oneida Co.

Nursery Work
Suffolk Co.
Westchester Co. (100)

Farm Service
Oswego Co. (3)
Cortland Co.

Fruit & Vegetable Work
Monroe Co.
Niagara Co. (50)

Garden Center
Westchester Co. (100)

Mushroom Industry
Greene (25)

Sod Farming
Suffolk Co.

Duck Industry
Suffolk

Item #2 Are there jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries in your county for semi-skilled labor?

None	Few	Many	No Answer
5	36	3	2

Information concerning types and numbers of available jobs is given as in Item #1.

Dairy Work
Yates Co. (25)
Dutchess Co. (10-20)
Jefferson Co. (100)
Essex Co.
Delaware Co.
Alleghany Co.
Columbia Co.
Rensselaer Co.
Niagara Co.
Cortland Co.
Ontario Co.
Chenango Co.

Farm Machinery Operator
Yates Co. (10)
Orleans Co.
Monroe Co.
Madison Co.
Niagara Co.
Ontario Co.
Westchester Co.
Cattaraugus Co.

Machinery Repair	Farm Labor	Nurseries
Monroe Co.	Seneca Co. (1-4)	Suffolk Co. (25)
Cortland Co.	Ontario Co.	Westchester Co.
Fulton Co.	Oneida Co.	
Onondaga Co.	Otsego Co.	
	Sullivan Co.	

Feed Mills	Pruning	Packing, Grading & Processing
Cortland Co.	Yates Co. (50)	Suffolk Co. (25)
Fulton Co.	Ulster Co.	Ulster Co.
		Madison Co.

Home Aids	Herdsman	Ground Maintenance
Oswego Co.	Monroe Co.	Greene Co.

Sod Farms

Suffolk Co.

The Monroe County Agent indicated a total of 100-150 semi-skilled jobs available, but did not categorize them. The Niagara County Agent estimated 25 available semi-skilled jobs.

Item #3 Do you think employers in your area would consider a former migrant desirable for available positions?

Yes	No	No Answer	Under Certain Conditions
16	6	5	20

(Conditions listed on questionnaire:
Has the needed skill or is qualified - 9
Motivated - Dependable-Reliable - 7
Educated - 1
Can find his own housing - 2)

Item #4 Do you think that former migrants would have to be re-trained in order to be acceptable for work in your area?

Yes	No	No Answer	Some would, others would not
32	5	6	3

Item #5 If so, what type of program do you feel would be most successful or suitable in your area?

Government	Government & Business	Business	Either	No Answer
4	19	10	2	11

Item #6 Is private industry in your area willing to train un-skilled individuals?

Yes	No	No Answer	Some are Willing
26	5	9	6

Item #7 Are there presently any former migrants working in non-migratory, full-time positions in your county?

Yes	No	No Answer
22	17	7

The counties which reported actual numbers of migrants who have settled in the area are listed below, with the reported numbers in parentheses.

Livingston Co. (10-20)
Columbia Co. (20)
Wayne Co. (100-200)
Schoharie Co. (less than 10)
*Suffolk Co. (10,000-15,000)
Niagara Co. (50-100)
Chemung Co. (10-20)
Madison Co. (5)
Greene Co. (less than 10)
Orange Co. (100)
Ontario Co. (6-8)

Do the workers seem satisfied?

Yes	No	Uncertain	No Answer
12	0	0	10

Do the employers seem satisfied?

12	0	0	10

Item #8 In your opinion, what would be the attitude of your community toward a former migrant settling in the area?

Positive	Negative	Indifferent	No Answer	Other
7	6	27	4	Depends on individual (1) Negative to indifferent (1)

*Reported that many had been in the county for years.

Conclusions Drawn From the Questionnaires

1. Full-time work in agriculture is available for seasonal farm workers who desire or are forced to leave the migrant stream. It is impossible to determine the exact number of jobs available in particular areas because of the imperfect return of the questionnaires sent and the fact that the figures given in many cases were estimates, while many returns gave no figures. From the information which has been compiled, however, there is an obvious conclusion: There are jobs available in agriculture or agriculture-related industries which former migrants could fill. The data summarization gives indications of which areas might offer the best employment opportunities.

2. Numbers of employers have successfully hired former migrants. A list of growers and businesses who have hired was compiled from the questionnaires. An attempt was made to contact all growers and businesses which were named. The information gathered from the contacts will be given in the next section.

3. Responses to the question regarding community attitudes toward the settlement of former migrants in an area indicate that they might have more trouble than the average person in settling in many areas of the State.

Contacts with Prospective Employers

With the aid of the previously-discussed questionnaire, a list of businesses and growers who were thought to have hired former migrants on a full-time basis or were felt to be potentially willing to do so was compiled. These individuals and corporations were sent letters and questionnaires in order to determine more accurately their attitudes toward hiring former migrant workers. Growers and businesses are listed separately. The asterisk indicates those who responded to the letter and questionnaire. The double asterisk designates those who responded positively, indicating satisfaction with those hired and/or willingness to hire in the future.

The following is the letter of introduction and the questionnaire sent to the businesses and growers:

241B New Jersey St.
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y. 12903

I am working with the New York State Center for Migrant Studies, researching the effects of agricultural mechanization on the living and economic conditions of migrants in the State, and trying to find solutions to the economic instability which may result from this mechanization. I am presently looking into retraining and re-employment programs and seeking new employment opportunities for migrants who are displaced by mechanization and wish to go into full-time work and settle permanently in an area.

It has been brought to my attention that you either have hired former migrants for full-time positions or might be willing to do so. I am interested in your opinions regarding the degree of success or possible success of these workers and the type of retraining that might be required to prepare them for openings in your business.

It would be most helpful if you would complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. I am also interested in any additional observations or opinions you might have.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Howard W. Taylor

1. Have you ever hired migratory labor on a seasonal basis?

2. If so, were you satisfied with the quality of the work? Why or why not?

3. Have you ever hired individuals who were formerly migrants for full-time positions?

4. How many did or do you hire?

5. What kinds of positions did or do they fill?

6. Did they have to be retrained?

   If so, could you describe the type and degree of training?

7. Are they reliable workers?

8. Are their wages comparable to those of other employees in your organization?

9. Would you be willing to hire more migrants if there were job openings in your business?

   Why or why not?

10. If you have not previously hired former migrants, for full-time positions, would you be willing to do so if the openings were available?

Growers Contacted

1.	**LaMont Farms	Albion, N. Y.
2.	**Marshall Cook	Bergen, N. Y.
3.	**Edward Sharp	Byron, N. Y.
4.	Al Poplock	Cementon, N. Y.
5.	**M. G. Hurd & Sons	Clintondale, N. Y.
6.	Carl Knaust	Coxsackie, N. Y.
7.	Charles Andala	Highland, N. Y.
8.	**Ruff Farms Inc.	Margaretville, N. Y.
9.	**J. R. Clarke	Milton, N. Y.
10.	Gary Hepworth	Milton, N. Y.
11.	Moriello Brothers	New Paltz, N. Y.

*This person or business responded to the questionnaire.

**This person or business responded positively to the questionnaire, indicating satisfaction with those hired and/or willingness to hire former migrants in the future.

Businesses Contacted

1.	*T. Whitening Manufacturing Co.	Akron, N. Y.
2.	**Agway Cold Storage	Albion, N. Y.
3.	**Thomas Lipton Inc.	Albion, N. Y.
4.	**Lyston Foods	Albion, N. Y.
5.	**Agway, Port of Albany	Albany, N. Y.
6.	**Sterling Homex Corp.	Avon, N. Y.
7.	*Cornucopia Farms	Barker, N. Y.
8.	Southerland Foods	Barker, N. Y.
9.	Curtis-Burns Foods Inc.	Bergen, N. Y.
10.	Sands, Bryton and Son	Bergen, N. Y.
11.	**Owens-Illinois Glass	Brockport, N. Y.
12.	*Quaker Maid Foods Inc.	Brockport, N. Y.
13.	**American Valve Corp.	Coxsackie, N. Y.
14.	**Dunkirk Radiator	Dunkirk, N. Y.
15.	Fredonia Foods	Dunkirk, N. Y.
16.	**Nestle's Chocolate	Fulton, N. Y.
17.	Seal-right Corp.	Fulton, N. Y.
18.	**Robson Seed Farms	Hall, N. Y.
19.	Duffy-Mott Inc.	Hamlin, N. Y.
20.	*Lincoln Fruit Juices	Highland, N. Y.
21.	Teddy's Frosted Foods	Highland, N. Y.
22.	Duffy-Mott Inc.	Holley, N. Y.
23.	*Textile By-Products	Hudson, N. Y.
24.	**Eastern Artificial Breeders Coop.	Ithaca, N. Y.
25.	N. Y. Dairy Herd Improvement Assoc.	Ithaca, N. Y.
26.	**Harrison Radiator Division, G. M.	Lockport, N. Y.
27.	R.G.R. Foods	Lockport, N. Y.
28.	**Simonds Saw and Steel	Lockport, N. Y.
29.	*Speas Co.	Lyonsville, N. Y.
30.	**Abex Corp.	Medina, N. Y.
31.	Hudson River Fruit Distributors	Milton, N. Y.
32.	**Hudson Valley Apple Products Inc.	Milton, N. Y.
33.	Norco Food Distributors	Milton, N. Y.
34.	**Royal Container Inc.	Milton, N. Y.
35.	Newfane Lumber Co.	Newfane, N. Y.
36.	Norwich Mills	Norwich, N. Y.
37.	Norwich Shoe Co.	Norwich, N. Y.
38.	**Brennaman Corp.	Oswego, N. Y.
39.	*Sectional Structures Corp.	Oswego, N. Y.
40.	Prospect Dairy	Stanford, N. Y.
41.	**L and B Products	Stottville, N. Y.
42.	Beauknit Fibers	Utica, N. Y.
43.	Empire Waste and Metal	Utica, N. Y.
44.	**Masonic Home	Utica, N. Y.
45.	St. Elizabeth's Hospital	Utica, N. Y.
46.	Universal Waste	Utica, N. Y.
47.	*Utica State Hospital	Utica, N. Y.
48.	**American Tree and Wreath	West Coxsackie, N. Y.

In the course of additional phases of his research, the author obtained the names of the following prospective employers. They were all contacted personally or by mail. The letter and questionnaire used in contacting the growers and businesses on the previous lists were again used for correspondence. The questionnaire was used as an interview guide in personal contacts.

1.	**Brooke Farms Inc.	Byron, N. Y.
2.	**Kelly Brothers Nursery	Dansville, N. Y.
3.	Gateway Vending Co.	Hyde Park, N. Y.
4.	**Widmer's Wine Cellars, Inc.	Naples, N. Y.
5.	**Dairy Lee	New York, N. Y.
6.	**Herman's Nursery Inc.	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
7.	*Rood's Florist & Greenhouses	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
8.	*Eastern Milk Producers	Syracuse, N. Y.
9.	*Agway	Syracuse, N. Y.
10.	*Swift & Co., Soybean Products Division	Champaign, Illinois
11.	*Coca-Cola Company, Foods Division	Aubrundale, Florida

Total number of growers and businesses contacted - 70
Number which responded - 44, 2 out-of-state
42 in New York

Because this report is concerned with conditions in New York State, the following data summarization will indicate information received from the 42 in-state replies.

Item #1 Have you ever hired migratory labor on a seasonal basis?

Yes	No	No Answer
15	20	7

Item #2 (Refers only to those 15 who answered "yes" on Item #1) If so, were you satisfied with the quality of the work? Why or why not?

Yes(generally)	No(generally)	In some cases
8	2	5

Reasons given for dissatisfaction:

Not dependable (2)
Drinking problems (2)
Late reporting (1)
Poor job performance (1)
Absenteeism (2)

Item #3 Have you ever hired individuals who were formerly migrants for full-time positions?

Yes	No	Unsure	No Answer
26	6	4	6

Items 4 - 9 refer only to the 26 people answering "yes" on Item #3.

Item #4 How many did or do you hire?

21 businesses totaled 199 former migrant employees.
3 businesses were unable to determine the number.
2 businesses did not answer.

Item #5 What kinds of positions did or do they fill?

The kinds of positions mentioned are listed below; figures indicate the total number of positions of that type mentioned.

Tractor operator (12)
Farm foreman (3)
General farm help (3)
Nursery work (20)

Factory work (89)
Pruning and Packing (46)
Factory machine operators (25)
Factory foreman (1)

There are 115 in factory jobs, compared to 84 in agriculture or agri-business.

Item #6 Did they have to be retrained?

Yes	No
18	8

Of the 18 responding "yes", all indicated some form of on-the-job training.

Item #7 Are they reliable workers?

Yes	No	Some	No Answer
14	4	6	2

Item #8 Are their wages comparable to those of other employees in your organization?

Yes - <u>all</u> 26

Item #9 Would you be willing to hire more migrants if there were job openings in your business?

Yes	No
24	2

Item #10 If you have not previously hired former migrants for full-time positions, would you be willing to do so if the openings were available? (Refers.to the 16 businesses which did not indicate they had formerly hired migrants for full-time positions.)

Yes	Did not answer
9	7

Conclusions from Questionnaires Sent to Businesses

1. Former migrants have been successfully hired by growers and businesses.
2. Business is genersllly satisfied with their work.
3. They appear to be making wages comparable to those of other workers.
4. Retraining is usually accomplished on a local on-the-job training level.

Possibility of Employment in Dairy Work

Recognizing the present need for reliable labor on dairy farms and the migrant worker's desire to stay in agriculture, the author decided to interview dairymen in the Champlain Valley in order to determine their willingness to hire a former migrant for a full-time position. With the aid of the Miner Institute in Chazy, N. Y., a cross-section of Clinton County dairymen requiring hired labor was chosen. Six of the dairymen were interviewed. It was felt that these interviews would indicate the attitudes of an additional group of agricultural employers and reveal further employment possibilities.

It should be noted that Clinton County could be a particularly favorable area for finding full-time positions for migrant workers. The high degree of respect which the apple growers have for the migrant workers they hire has probably been noted by other farmers in the area, including the dairymen.

The following guide was used for interviewing the dairymen:

1. How do you think mechanization has affected the migrant worker?
2. Do you have a need for additional labor?
3. Would you be willing to hire a former migrant?
4. With or without government financial subsidy or assistance?
5. How do you think a migrant worker entering full-time farm labor should be trained for the job?

Results of the Interview

Item #1	All felt that mechanization has greatly decreased the labor demand in agriculture.
Item #2	5 of the 6 need more hired help; they indicated a total of 6 positions to fill.
Item #3	All stated that they definitely would be willing to hire a former migrant worker if the man were "willing to work."
Item #4	Only 2 of the 6 felt that they would need some government help through prior training or subsidy.

Item #5 3 would prefer that their workers be trained on the job.

3 felt the workers should have some government training prior to OJT.

Conclusions from the Interviews

1. There is a willingness by dairymen to hire former migrants for full-time positions.
2. There are openings for hired labor in the dairy industry.

Former Migrants in New Jobs

An additional effort was made to determine the degree of success of former migrant workers in new positions by contacting them. Twenty-three were contacted by mail, with an anticipated poor response; and six were interviewed personally. Of the twenty-three, only two responded. Personal contacts would have been more successful, but limitations in resources prevented this. Consequently, a representative sampling was not attained; it is felt, however, that the responses of those contacted merit inclusion in this report. The letter of introduction and attached questionnaire follow:

241B New Jersey St.
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y. 12903

Dear

I am working with the New York State Center for Migrant Studies, and I am presently trying to determine how satisfied former migrants are with their new jobs. I understand that you were formerly a seasonal farm worker, but that you have now gone into another kind of work or into full-time farm work. I am interested in finding out how you feel about your new job.

If you would circle the correct answer to the questions on the enclosed sheet of paper and return the paper in the addressed envelope which I have included, you would be helping me to help other people in migratory farm work who need to or want to find new jobs.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Howard Taylor

1. Are you making better wages now than when you were in migratory field work? Yes No

2. Do you feel that you are supporting your family more adequately now? Yes No

3. Did you receive training for the job? Yes No

   If you did receive training would you answer the following questions?

   Who gave you the training?

   How long did it last?

   Was it difficult?

4. Do you like the type of work you are doing now better than the field work which you did before?
   Yes No

5. Are you glad that you moved to your new job? Yes No

6. Why did you leave migratory farm work?

   A. Because there was not enough migrant farm work available to keep me busy.

   B. I did not like the kind of work.

   C. I was not satisfied with the pay.

   D. Other (give the reason, if possible)

The two responses are summarized below:

1. Both indicated that they are making better wages now.

2. Both feel that they are presently more adequately supporting their families.

3. One had received one week's training from General Motors Corporation.

4. Both like the type of work they are doing now better than migratory field work.

5. Both are glad they moved to a new job.

6. Both stated that they had left migratory farm work because of low wages and job dissatisfaction.

Six former migrants were interviewed personally. Two of those interviewed work with SEA (Seasonal Employment in Agriculture) at Riverhead, N. Y.; one works with the Self-Help Housing program in Riverhead. Two work with Calverton Industries, a construction company in Calverton, N. Y., and one is employed in an apple warehouse near Poughkeepsie. The following interview guide was used:

1. What is your present job?
2. Are you satisfied with it?
3. How were you trained (OJT, etc.)?
4. How does your salary compare to your previous wages?
5. Have your living conditions improved?
6. How long were you in the migrant stream?
   How long have you been out?
7. Are you satisfied with your present housing?
8. Do you like the area and community?
9. Do you feel that the use of farm machinery pushed you out of migrant work?
10. What effect do you think mechanization has in the long run?
11. How do you think the overall problem should be solved?

The data from the interviews is summarized below:

Item #2	(6) Stated that they liked their work
Item #3	(2) Had received on-the-job training (3) Were trained by Self-Help Housing (1) Learned through experience
Item #4	(6) Stated that they were satisfied with their present salary (1) A former crew leader stated that now he didn't have to "hurt anyone in order to earn a good salary"
Item #5	(6) Felt that their living conditions had improved
Item #6	(4) Had been out of the migrant stream more than a year (2) Had been out less than a year
Item #7	(6) Are satisfied with their present housing
Item #8	(4) Liked the community (2) Indicated some dissatisfaction
Item #9	(3) Felt that mechanization had pushed them out of migrant work
Item #10	(2) Felt that mecahnization forces people on to welfare rolls (3) Felt that it has been a blessing, forcing blacks to obtain better jobs (1) No answer
Item #11	(4) Felt that the overall problem of displaced migrant workers should be solved through on-the-job training (1) Suggested a massive government work program (1) No answer

Indications from Contacts with Former Migrant Workers in New Positions

1. They are better satisfied in their new jobs.
2. They live better.
3. They feel that mechanization has been a major factor in forcing their transition and that the transition has been a beneficial one.
4. They seem to feel that on-the-job training (OJT) is a better answer to employment problems than massive programs.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Migrant workers have been and will continue to be displaced by machines. Though some growers may not agree, there have been obvious job losses caused by mechanization, as shown by the Cornell University figures mentioned at the beginning of this report and the employment figures given by the Agricultural Employment Representatives in Oneida, Steuben and Clinton Counties. In addition, some of the former migrants interviewed felt that mechanization had forced them out and many who were still in migratory work feared the loss of a market for their labor.

2. Mechanization may have very positive effects on the migrant worker. It will force him in to more steady, often more skilled, positions which offer better wages and the chance for a more stable family and social life.

3. For the most part, migrant workers feel that if they are displaced by mechanization they would like to continue to work in agriculture.

4. There are openings in full-time positions in agriculture. Dairymen, especially, presently need reliable hired labor. Agricultural employers have indicated willingness to hire former migrants for steady positions. There is also a labor market in rural or small-town industry, which would seem to offer the next most desirable job environment. Considering the preferences of seasonal farm workers and the employment opportunities, agriculture and rural business provide the best alternatives for displaced workers.

5. Former migrant workers have obtained full-time jobs and they, as well as the employers, have indicated satisfaction.

6. Former migrant workers have, for the most part, received any needed training through on-the-job training with their employer, a method which has proved to be quite satisfactory.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. More effort should be made to establish displaced migrant workers in agriculture, agribusiness, or rural business, where a need exists and where they prefer working. The first step could be greater cooperation between government agencies specializing in agriculture, employment, and the welfare of the migrant.

2. Most migrant workers will need some degree of retraining to prepare them for these positions. Business-initiated on-the-job training has proved to be successful in many cases and should continue to prepare the bulk of the displaced workers. Formal, government-financed training programs assisting seasonal farm workers have had positive results. They are expensive, however; and training the "whole man" for the large number of people involved is more idealistic than realistic, although this type of program is often very effective and almost necessary in some cases.

Implementing the type of plan which could retrain all displaced migrant workers is out of the question at this time because of general public discontent with the cost and results of massive government-sponsored programs. An additional problem is the fact that the trainee is not always guaranteed employment upon completion of the program. Consequently, the best solution is for business to assume a great deal of the responsibility for retraining migrant workers through on-the-job training. The term "business" as used here, includes individual farmers and growers, agribusiness, and rural industry. It may be necessary to develop a plan of government incentive to encourage businesses to initiate such programs. The greatest concern should be with placing a man in a job with which he can support his family adequately, lead a normal social life, and preserve his sense of dignity. If he is permanently settled and a good provider, his children will be spending their time in school, instead of the field, and preparing themselves for a normal adulthood in our society.

3. An effort should be made by State and Federal agencies to minimize the labor problems which regulations often cause growers; these problems have often led the grower to mechanize and to displace migrant workers, although he would like to continue hand-picking.

4. There should be concern over the fact that many migrant workers, even those in crops which are partially or almost totally mechanized, seem unaware of the threat to their job. They should be made aware of the possible effects of mechanization on their job future, so that they can prepare for meeting the problems which may arise.

END